

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,237 07/11/2003		Yasushi Toda	Q76482	2854	
23373	7590	04/26/2006	EXAMINER		
SUGHRU		PLLC NA AVENUE, N.W.	DAO, MINH D		
SUITE 800		III II V ENOE, IV.W.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHING	TON, DO	20037	2618		
			DATE MAILED: 04/26/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		App	lication No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			617,237	TODA, YASUSHI					
			miner	Art Unit					
			H D. DAO	2618					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears	on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence ad	ldress				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comn o period for reply is specified above, the maximum st re to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IAILING DATE ( of 37 CFR 1.136(a). I nunication. atutory period will appl will, by statute, cause	OF THIS COMMUNIC n no event, however, may a re y and will expire SIX (6) MONT the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed  HS from the mailing date of this country (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·				
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on							
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
′=									
- ۱	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims	<b>,</b>	,,						
· _		application							
-	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
•	· · · ———								
·	Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.								
	Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	stion and/or aloc	tion requirement						
الــا(٥	claim(s) are subject to restric	cilon and/or elec	don requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers								
9)[	The specification is objected to by th	e Examiner.							
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11)	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
Attachmen	t(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			ummary (PTO-413)					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F			/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PT0	O <sub>-</sub> 152)				
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date	L10/2R/08)	6)  Other:		J-102)				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-6,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Horii (US 2002/0022504).

Regarding claim 1, Horii teaches a mobile terminal device having an antenna portion, wherein the antenna portion comprising: a tip portion located outside a casing of the mobile terminal device (see figs. 1A,1B,1C; section [0037]); and a switch unit controlling an operation of the mobile terminal device (see fig. 3; section [0043]. Switch 9/10 which controls the detection of the antenna's directions (forward and reverse) reads on the switch of the present invention).

Regarding claim 2, Horii teaches the mobile terminal device according to claim 1, wherein the switch unit is operated by operating the tip portion, and the mobile terminal device performs a predetermined operation (see section [0037,0043]).

Regarding claim 3, Horii teaches the mobile terminal device according to claim 2,

wherein the switch unit includes at least one of a depression switch and a rotation

switch (see sections [0013-0016,0037,0042,0059]).

Regarding claim 4, Horii teaches the mobile terminal device according to claim 3,

wherein the depression switch is operated by pressing a tip portion thereof, and the

rotation switch is operated by rotating a tip portion thereof (see sections [0013-

0016,0037,0042,0059]).

Regarding claim 5, Horii teaches the mobile terminal device according to claim 2,

wherein respective operation modes of the tip portion correspond to respective

operations of the mobile terminal device (see sections [0013-0016,0037,0042,0059,

0021]).

Regarding claim 6, Horii teaches the mobile terminal device according to claim 5,

wherein the operation modes of the tip portion, in which the mobile terminal device is

operated, are changeable (see sections [0016-0021]).

Regarding claim 11, Horii teaches the mobile terminal device according to claim 2, further comprising a display unit, wherein the display unit displays an operation item of the mobile terminal device in accordance with a predetermined operation mode of the tip portion of the antenna portion (see sections [0016-0021, 0034]).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horii (US 2002/0022504) in view of Kim (US 6,681,120).

Regarding claim 7, Horii, as mentioned above, teaches the limitations of claim 6, but does not disclose that the mobile terminal device outputs an alarm signal in accordance with a predetermined operation mode of the tip portion. Kim, in an analogous art, teaches a mobile communication device capable of activating an alarm button when the user is in need for an emergency assistance, and notifying the authority the location of the device (see col. 4, lines 27-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Kim to Horii in order for the combined system of Horii and Kim to

automatically communicate with a remote facility and transmitting emergency data

including sounds, pictures, location when activated by the user as taught by Kim (see

col. 1, lines 19-29).

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Horii and Kim teaches the mobile terminal device

according to claim 7, wherein the alarm signal is a sound wave signal (see col. 4, lines

27-67).

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Horii and Kim teaches the mobile terminal device

according to claim 7, wherein the alarm signal is a radio wave signal (see col. 4, lines

27-67).

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Horii and Kim teaches the mobile terminal

device according to claim 9, wherein the mobile terminal device sends an alarm signal

including at least one of a current position of the mobile terminal device and a

predetermined message to at least any of a police station and a rescue center (see col.

4, lines 27-67).

5.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horii

Page 6

(US 2002/0022504) in view of Boesen (US 6,542,721).

Regarding claim 12, Horii, as mentioned above, teaches the limitations of claim 6, but

does not disclose that the mobile terminal device includes first and second casings

connected to each other by a hinge portion, and the display unit can be viewed from an

outside in a state where the first and second casings are folded. Boesen, in an

analogous art, teaches a handheld personal electronic device having multiple displays

and one of the displays can be viewed when the device in a folded closed position (see

figs. 18,19; col. 7, lines 23-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of

Boesen to Horii in order for the user of the combined system of Horii and Boesen to

view the information on the display of the device when it is in the folded closed position

as taught by Boesen.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horii

(US 2002/0022504) in view of Kaufman et al. (US 6,710,576).

Regarding claim 13, Horii, as mentioned above, teaches the limitations of claim 1, but

does not disclose that the mobile terminal device according to claim 1, further

comprising: a first battery holder for a first battery and a second battery holder for a

second battery, wherein the mobile terminal device is operated by the second battery in

a case where the first battery is lost. Kaufman, in an analogous art, teaches a cellular

phone having a first and a second battery (see claim 1; figs. 1-5; col. 4, lines 13-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to provide the above teaching of Kaufman to Horii in order for the

combined system to extend the operation of the device without the need fro an auxiliary

battery as taught by Kaufman (see col. 2, lines 8-10).

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horii

(US 2002/0022504) in view of Baermann (US 4,419,644).

Regarding claim 14, Horii, as mentioned above, teaches the limitations of claim 3, but

does not disclose that the rotation switch includes a permanent magnet magnetized in a

predetermined direction, and a search coil. Baermann, in an analogous art, teaches a

holding device, which is part of an antenna assembly, having rotatable magnet that

magnetizes in rotative switched or switched off position (see col. 1, line 51 to col. 2, line

23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Baermann to Horii in order

for the combined system to effectively create magnetized force to hold the antenna

while rotating the antenna to operate the communication device.

8. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horii (US 2002/0022504) in view of Miyamoto et al. (US 6,614,737).

Regarding claim 15, Horii, as mentioned above, teaches the limitations of claim 3, but does not disclose that the rotation switch includes a reflection plate, a light-emitting element emitting light onto the reflection plate, and a photodetection element receiving reflected light from the reflection plate. Miyamoto, in an analogous art, teaches an optical information device including a photodetection means that receives and analyzes light reflected from a reflection light caused by a rotation of a motor. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Miyamoto to Horii in order to covert the light information into electrical signal as taught by Miyamoto.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH D. DAO whose telephone number is 571-272-7851. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MATTHEW ANDERSON can be reached on 571-272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/617,237 Page 9

Art Unit: 2618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Minh Dao MD AU 2618 April 20, 2006

Matthew Anderson Superviser AU 2618